DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 114 CG 024 106

AUTHOR Sandhu, Daya S.; And Others
TITLE Cross-Cultural Counseling and Neurolinguistic Mirroring: An Exploration of Empathy, Trustworthiness, and Positive Interaction with Native American Adolescents.
PUB DATE Mar 91
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Counseling and Development (Baltimore, MD, March 27-30, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *American Indians; *Counseling; *Counseling Effectiveness; *Counseling Techniques; *Counselor Client Relationship; Credibility; *Cross Cultural Studies; Empathy
IDENTIFIERS *Neurolinguistic Mirroring

ABSTRACT

The quality of the therapeutic relationship is a prime consideration in counseling and psychotherapy. Good rapport in the counseling relationship has consistently been associated with beneficial changes. This study examined the effects of neurolinguistic mirroring versus non-mirroring of selected nonverbal behaviors on empathy, trustworthiness, and positive interaction in a cross-cultural setting. Choctaw adolescents (N=60) between 14 and 19 years of age were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. Two Caucasian female counselors mirrored and non-mirrored equal numbers of subjects for 10 minutes. Each dyad was videotaped. Data were collected by using the revised empathy scale of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory and the trustworthiness dimension of the Counselor Rating Form to assess the degree of empathy and trustworthiness as perceived by the subjects. Each videotaped dyad was rated with the Leathers Non-verbal Feedback Rating Instrument. The findings suggest that mirroring of kinesics enhances clients' perceived empathy, at least with adolescents of a different culture than their counselors. The significance of these mirroring meta-tactics lies in the fact that they may be helpful in both mono- and cross-cultural counseling. In the presence of barriers between the clients and the counselors relating to differences of languages, world views, values, and a host of other factors, this technique may prove effective in the initial stages of counseling. (Author/LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED344114

Cross-Cultural Counseling and Neurolinguistic Mirroring: An Exploration of Empathy, Trustworthiness, and Positive Interaction with Native American Adolescents

Daya S. Sandhu
University of Louisville

T. Glen Reeves
Mississippi State University

Pedro R. Portes
University of Louisville

Running head: NEUROLINGUISTIC MIRRORING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Daya S. Sandhu

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG024106

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study examined the effects of Neurolinguistic mirroring vs. non-mirroring of selected nonverbal behaviors on empathy, trustworthiness, and positive interaction in a cross-cultural setting. Sixty randomly selected Choctaw adolescents, between 14-19 years of age ($X = 16.54$) were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. Two Caucasian female counselors mirrored and non-mirrored equal number of subjects for 10 minutes. Each dyad was videotaped. Data were collected by using the revised empathy scale of Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory and trustworthiness dimension of Counselor Rating Form to assess the degree of empathy and trustworthiness as perceived by the subjects. Each video taped dyad was rated with the Leathers Non-verbal Feedback Rating Instrument. ANOVA results indicated significant mirroring effects ($p < .05$) on the empathy scale of the BLRI. Practical implications of Neurolinguistic mirroring in counseling and psychotherapy are discussed in relation to future research needs.

Introduction

The quality of the therapeutic relationship is a prime consideration in counseling and psychotherapy. Good rapport in the counseling relationships has consistently been associated with beneficial changes (Rogers, 1957; Egan, 1975; Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967). For this reason, empathy and trustworthiness, the two core elements of a rapport, have become the sine qua non of effective counseling (Tepper and Haase, 1978). They are particularly crucial in cross-cultural counseling. According to Atkinson, Morten, and Sue (1983):

> Much of the criticism related to minority group counseling focuses upon the interactions that occur between counselor and client. Counseling is seen as a process of interpersonal interaction and communication which requires accurate sending and receiving of both verbal and nonverbal messages. When the counselor and client come from different cultural backgrounds, barriers to communication are likely to develop, leading to misunderstandings that destroy rapport and render counseling ineffective. (p. 16)

Mehrabian (1971) found that "total liking equals 7% verbal liking plus 38% vocal liking plus 55% facial liking" (p. 43). (7% verbal and 93% nonverbal) suggesting that nonverbal factors far outweigh the verbal. Several other researchers (Argyle, 1967; McCroskey & Wheeless, 1976; Knapp, 1978; Argyle, Alkema, and Gilmour 1971; Bergin & Garfield, 1971; Carkhuff, 1971) have made similar observations. Gladstein's (1974) review of nonverbal communication notes "that

there is universal agreement by clinicians as to the importance of NVC in counseling/therapy" (p. 40).

Nonverbal behaviors (NVC) have a significant impact on counseling which include primarily kinesics, paralinguistics, and proxemics. The effects of several nonverbal behaviors such as, eye movements, body postures, facial expressions, gestures, body movements, tonality, and vocal intonations have been empirically tested in numerous studies (Broekman & Moller, 1973; Chaikin, Derlega & Miller, 1976; Graves & Robinson, 1976; Hackney, 1974; LaCrosse, 1975; Smith-Hanen, 1977). Positive results on dimensions of empathy, genuineness, and expertness have also been noted; smiling (Bays, 1972) head nodding (Gladstein, 1974), liking (Mehrabian, 1971) arm and leg positions (Smith-Hanen, 1977), and touch (Hubble, Noble, & Robinson, 1981).

Of all the nonverbal communication modalities, kinesics, namely body movements and posture, hold the most central position in research due to the ease and objectivity through which body movements can be observed, manipulated, and verified. Scheflen (1964) was perhaps the first to recognize the significance of posture congruence in psychotherapy. He proposed that congruence in postures between persons means congruence of feelings and thoughts. Two persons in postural congruity tend to sit or stand in mirror-imaged positions and look direct carbon copies of each other.

Smith and Williamson (1981), note:

> Communicators in rapport are consciously aware of their rapport but not of the nature of the shared beat which

> underlies it. An individual's body rhythm which is continuously geared to the cadence of his or her own speech is communicated to others through speech and body motion and mutually adjusted to establish interpersonal synchrony . . . (p. 232).

A few experimental studies conducted on the effects of posture mirroring on rapport, have yielded conflicting results. Trout and Rosenfeld (1980) investigated the effects of posture lean and body congruence and concluded that in mirror-imaged positions, the therapeutic relationship was rated higher than in non-mirrored image positions. A study by LaFrance and Ickes (1981), on the other hand, found a negative relationship between mirroring and rapport and also in mirroring and verbalizations. Maurer and Tindall (1983) later found that congruent postures enhanced client perceived empathy.

The Neurolinguistic Programming Model, Neurolinguistic Programming (NLP) has emerged as a promising approach in counseling and psychotherapy. Its originators, John Grinder, a linguist and Richard Bandler, a mathematician and computer expert, attempted to combine skills from diverse fields such as psychology, neuropsychology, linguistics, mathematics, cybernetics, and kinesics in developing their new approach to counseling and psychotherapy.

It is as a tool for effective communication that NLP has rapidly gained attention since its origin (Buckner, Meara, Reese & Reese, 1987; Harmon & O'Neill, 1981). A host of others have appeared on the scene "making straight-faced claims that their easily acquired

techniques might be used to cure phobias, shrink tumors in as little as two weeks and resolve lifelong traumas" (Conway & Siegelman, 1983, p. 72).

Dilts, Grinder, Bandler, and DeLozier (1980) note that:

> NLP presents specific tools which can be applied effectively in any human interaction. It offers specific techniques by which a practitioner may usefully organize and reorganize his or her subjective experience or the experiences of a client in order to define and subsequently secure any behavioral outcome.

Neuro-linguistic Programming has thus been associated with behavior changing tools and techniques called, "Meta-Tactics" (Grinder and Bandler, 1976) that include: anchoring, future pacing, modeling, matching, mirroring, reframing, leading, translating and many many more.

Among these numerous NLP Meta-tactics, mirroring is perhaps the most basic technique used in training to establish rapport and trust with the clients. Bandler and Grinder (1979) state:

> To the extent that you can match another person's behavior, both verbally and nonverbally, you will be pacing their experience. Mirroring is the essence of what most people call rapport and there are as many dimensions to it as your sensory experience can discriminate. You can mirror the other person's predicates and syntax, body posture, breathing, voice tone and tempo, eye blinks, etc. (p. 19).

It would seem that this aspect of NLP may have great practical

value, when rapport building becomes difficult due to cultural differences.

Language differences, lack of verbal expressiveness and verbal skills hinder rapport building in cross-cultural counseling (Vontress, 1973; Calia, 1966; Tyler, 1964; Wilson and Calhoun, 1974). For this reason, mirroring may be useful to explore empirically some other possibilities of rapport building in both mono and cross-cultural counseling.

Most nonverbal communication studies suggest that people mirror because they have good rapport; NLP exponents claim that people who mirror will have good rapport.

Empirical studies are scarce assertions of NLP supporters since the NLP model is relatively new. Storms (1982) may be the first one to test empirically whether pacing nonverbal behaviors in accordance with the NLP model enhances rapport. Fifty-five subjects divided unequally into three groups of 15, 17, and 23 watched a counseling interview analogue and completed the Carkhuff Empathy Scale and Counselor Evaluation Inventory. His results indicated that pacing verbal and nonverbal behaviors did enhance rapport in an analogue context.

The present study further examines mirroring of nonverbal behaviors, especially kinesics. This study differs in many ways from the traditional analogue studies which are based on observations of laboratory-based counseling situations. The present study approximates a natural setting since subjects participated in quasi-counseling sessions. Adolescent minority subjects were

selected for several important reasons related to empathy and trust. Developmentally, adolescent in this age range are beginning to employ formal operations in their thought that allow for consideration of others' point of view (Inhelder & Piaget, 1958). Minority adolescents represent an ideal group with whom to examine the facilitation of trust, empathy, and positive interaction by counselors.

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI), for those clients whose nonverbal behaviors were mirrored and those whose nonverbal behaviors were not mirrored.

2. There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on the trustworthiness scale of the Counselor Rating Form (CRF), of those clients whose nonverbal behaviors were mirrored and those whose nonverbal behaviors were not mirrored.

3. There is no significant difference between the mean ratings on the Leathers Nonverbal Feedback Rating Instrument (LNFRI) of clients whose nonverbal behaviors were mirrored and those whose nonverbal behaviors were not mirrored.

Subjects were chosen from a minority group population of Choctaw Indians. These subjects were bilingual and differed in ethnic and cultural backgrounds from those of their counselors. A list of 109 male Choctaw adolescents, 14-19 years old, possessing at least 1/4 degree of Indian blood was prepared. Participation of all these high

school students in this study was on a voluntary basis to meet with a counselor to discuss high school graduation requirements. From this pool of volunteers with an assigned number, 60 male students were selected by using a table of random numbers.

Selection of Counselors

Two master-level female students with similar educational and counseling experiences from a nearby state university provided mirroring and non-mirroring treatments. These counselors were also matched on extraneous variables of age and ethnic background. Moreover, they dressed similarly and followed the same protocol in initiating and terminating the counseling session interview.

Instruments

The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) (1962) and the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) prepared by Barak, A. and LaCrosse, M. (1975) were administered to measure the client-perceived empathy and trustworthiness respectively. While these instruments BLRI and CRF were used to measure empathy and trustworthiness from the clients' perspective; for an objective evaluation of each counseling dyad, a third instrument, the Leathers Nonverbal Feedback Rating Instrument (LNFRI) (1978) was employed as a measure of positive interaction.

Procedure

Two video cameras were used to videotape all counseling sessions. Each session lasted 10 minutes. Similar seating arrangements were made for both counselors and their clients. In each dyad, both counselors and their clients were seated in identical chairs at a distance of 36" (91 cm) from each other and faced the video cameras

which were placed 55" (140 cm) away from them.

Training

The counselors were trained to mirror or non-mirror directly and nondirectly nonverbal behaviors. For mirroring conditions, the counselors were trained to serve as if they were a looking glass for the client. While mirroring directly, they were taught to mimic clients' nonverbal behaviors in such a way that if the client moved his right arm, the counselor moved the left arm, and if the clients' head leaned toward the left, the counselor's head leaned toward the right. When it seemed that direct mirroring was either not possible or mirroring might become embarrassing to the client; Lankton's (1980) suggestions of crossover or indirect mirroring were followed:

> Instead of trying to match breathing along with an asthmatic you might pace by raising and lowering your thumb; you could tap your foot whenever a client blinked, move your hand when he shifted his head and so on. (p. 60).

In non-mirroring position, the counselors were taught to behave spontaneously and not to make any deliberate efforts to copy the nonverbal behaviors of their clients. Should the client start emulating the counselor's nonverbal behaviors, the counselors were asked to immediately assume a non-mirrored position. The training of the counselors was conducted one week before the experiment. During their practice sessions in a pilot study with eight participants, the counselors used the list of selected nonverbal behaviors as their guide to conduct direct or indirect mirroring. After sufficient practice when it was felt that counselors had become proficient enough to give the treatment, four practice sessions of each counselor, two with treatment and two with non-treatment conditions

were videotaped.

Two independent judges, with masters degree in counseling, were asked to evaluate the performance of these counselors based on their close examinations of the videotaped sessions. These judges rated each counseling session independently by using "Specific Nonverbal Behaviors" checklists to verify if the counselors had successfully mirrored or non-mirrored the nonverbal behaviors of their clients.

Cohen's Kappa (Cohen, 1960) was used to calculate the inter-rater agreement between the two judges which resulted in K = .75.

Assignment of Subjects to Control and Treatment Conditions

After all 60 male subjects were given a number, they were randomly assigned to one of the following conditions shown in the diagram:

	Mirror	Non-Mirror
Counselor A	M	N
Counselor B	M	N

Namely:

1st Condition	Counselor A - -	Mirroring	AM
2nd Condition	Counselor A - -	Non-Mirroring	AN
3rd Condition	Counselor B - -	Mirroring	BM
4th Condition	Counselor B - -	Non-Mirroring	BN

Then by flipping a coin, it was decided which counselor will be called Counselor A and which one Counselor B. Next, the subjects were called in a random order to meet with their respective

counselors.

Treatment Process

Two subjects at a time were called in random order to meet with their respective counselors after every 10 minutes. From the previously prepared lists, the counselors knew if they were to mirror or non-mirror the selected non-verbal behaviors of their clients. Each counseling session lasted for 10 minutes and was videotaped with the knowledge and previously obtained consent of the subjects and their parents/ guardians.

Completion of BLRI and CRF

Immediately after each counseling session, the subjects were taken to the adjacent room to administer the BLRI and the CRF. The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) has 16 statements which were rated by the clients based on their perceptions by the counselor's expressed level of empathy during the counseling session. Each item is rated on a 6-point scale, from -3 to +3, where -3 is marked if the given statement describes what the client strongly feels is not true and +3 when the client strongly feels the statement is true. The scoring range of this scale is from -48 to 48. Test-retest reliability of the BLRI ranges from .79 to .89 on the subscales and .85 on the composite score (Reade & Smouse, 1980, p. 548).

The second instrument, the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) designed by Barak and LaCrosse (1978) purports to measure counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness as perceived by the client. The Trustworthiness-dimension of the CRF was the only

dimension which was utilized in this study. Bipolar adjectives pairs such as "confidential-revealing, dependable-undependable" were marked by the subjects on a 7-point scale for 12 items. The scores of this scale range from 12 to 84. Hill et al (1981) reported that split-half reliability for three dimensions ranges from .75 to .92.

Measuring Overall Interaction

The Leathers Nonverbal Feedback Rating Instrument (LNFRI) designed by Leathers (1978) was used to measure the quality of interaction between the counselors and their clients. While BLRI and CRF were used to measure empathy and trustworthiness from the client's perspective, LNFRI was chosen to provide a more objective evaluation of the students' reactions to the counselors. This instrument consists of 10 bipolar adjective pairs of antonyms. Each bipolar item is rated on a 7-point scale. Total scores range from a minimum of 10 to a maximum of 70. The higher total score signifies positive interaction between the communicators.

Two females with similar academic backgrounds and teaching experience were trained for 4 hours until they reached an inter-rater agreement of .88. These judges evaluated each counseling dyad independently with LNFRI for positive interaction. Their scores for each session were averaged to determine the final scores for the statistical analyses.

Results

The Two Groups Randomized Subjects, Posttest-Only Design was utilized for this study. Mirroring and non-mirroring of nonverbal behaviors of the subjects by the counselors were independent

variables and the scores on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI), the Counselor Rating Form (CRF), and the Leathers Nonverbal Feedback Rating Instrument (LNFRI) (1978) served as the dependent variables.

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of scores on all three dependent variables in mirrored and non-mirrored conditions.

Insert Table 1 about here

In an effort to determine if the significant differences observed in this study were due to differences between the two counselors, Neurolinguistic mirroring/non mirroring techniques or due to their interactions, the data were analyzed by using a Two-way Analysis of Variance. No statistically significant interaction or differences between Counselor A and Counselor B were found for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory, Counselor Rating Form, and Leathers Nonverbal Feedback Rating Instrument. In sum, the only significant difference was found between techniques of Neurolinguistic mirroring and non-mirroring on Revised Empathy Scale of BLRI, (F df 1,56 = 4.59 *, $p < .05$).

Discussion

The findings of this study support the assertions of NLP exponents, Bandler and Grinder (1975), Grinder and Bandler (1976), Dilts (1983), Jacobson (1983), and Laborde (1984) in that rapport (empathy) can be established or enhanced through mirroring of nonverbal behaviors.

This study also supports Maurer and Tindall's (1983) study using the BLRI to determine client-perceived empathy. However, our results contradict the findings of LaFrance and Ickes (1981), who contended that "results . . . showed a surprising negative relation between mirroring and rapport" (p. 139). The results also did not support the claims of NLP'ers that mirroring of nonverbal behaviors enhances trust.

It is important to note, however, that out of 30 subjects whose nonverbal behaviors were mirrored, not a single subject noticed that his counselor was mimicking his body movements. This observation is important because it implies that our nonverbal behaviors are modes of unconscious communication, we may or may not be aware of what messages we are sending, but we always communicate.

Although there were no significant differences on the Counseling Rating Form (CRF), mean scores of the experimental group were generally higher than those of the control group and had a positive relationship ($r = +.31$) with the empathy scales (which suggests a facilitative effect of mirroring nonverbal behaviors in a therapeutic relationship).

Conclusions and Recommendations

The findings of this study suggest that mirroring of kinesics enhances clients' perceived empathy, at least with adolescents of a different culture from that of their counselors. However, other areas were explored which did not prove significant as some NLP proponents would tend to believe such as trustworthiness. The significance of these mirroring meta-tactics lie in the fact that they may be helpful

in both, mono- and cross-cultural counseling. In the presence of barriers between the clients and the counselors relating to differences of languages, world views, values, and a host of other factors, this technique may prove effective in the initial stages of counseling. Since the technique of mirroring is relatively easy to learn and apparently unobtrusive, it could be even included in non-NLP training programs to equip the trainees with additional skills to facilitate or enrich the counseling processes.

The NLP model is relatively new. Claims made by its proponents, such as "as a quantum jump in the understanding of the process of human behavioral change" (Kraft, 1982, p. 62) are obviously overstated. It is apparent that at this stage, there is a wide gulf between the claims of NLP exponents and research findings. Most of the research done so far have mainly involved the NLP eye movement model and the NLP claim for a primary representational system (Buckner, Meara, Reese & Reese, 1987).

There is a need for more research in the area of meta-tactics of mirroring similar to the present study particularly with other populations. Available studies often show contradictory results. For example Storms (1982) supported the claims of NLP that mirroring enhances rapport Sandhu (1984) reported mixed results; empathy was enhanced, trustworthiness was not significant, and positive interaction was negatively perceived; while Rawls (1989) found no relationship between matching nonverbal behaviors and rapport.

While during the last fifteen years NLP has gained much popularity as a therapeutic orientation despite lack of empirical

support, well designed studies are needed to determine if specific techniques are helpful. This area is of particular significance in situations where counselor and client differ in a number of dimensions such as age, socio-economic status, sex and culture. To further our knowledge in this area, the following recommendations are made for addressing the limitations of the present study:

This study was limited to mirroring of kinesics only, which may have just partial effects. Future studies should include a combination of mirroring, proxemics, and breathing patterns as well. If it is possible, matching of clients' predicates could also be added to determine the total effects of verbal and non-verbal communications.

The present study was conducted in a cross-cultural setting where rapport building is hindered due to numerous cultural differences. Comparative studies that include various populations are needed that have designs where counselor-client pairs are matched and mismatched in terms of gender and ethnicity in counseling sessions.

The counseling session protocol in this study only focused on the graduation requirements from high school. It is recommended that future studies focus on samples with more representative counseling needs.

Finally, since the subjects of this study were all Choctaw male adolescents, studies should include other cultures and age groups, and must consider sex differences.

References

Argyle, M. (1967). The psychology of interpersonal behavior. Baltimore, MD: Penguin.

Argyle, M., Alkema, G., & Gilmour, R. (1971). The communication of friendly and hostile attitudes by verbal and nonverbal signals. European Journal of Social Psychology, 1, 385-402.

Atkinson, D., Morten, G., & Sue, D. (1983). Counseling American minorities. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.

Bandler, R., & Grinder, J. (1975). Patterns of the hypnotic techniques of Milton H. Erickson, M.D. (Vol. 1). Cupertino, CA: Meta Publications.

Bandler, R., & Grinder, J. (1979). Frogs into princes. Moab, UT: Real People Press.

Barak, A., & LaCrosse, M. B. (1975). Multidimensional perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22(6), 471-476.

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. (1962). Dimensions of therapist responses as causal factors in therapeutic changes. Psychological Monogrpahs, 76, (43, Whole No. 562).

Bays, M. A. (1972). Behavioral cues of interpersonal warmth. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39, 333-339.

Bergin, A. E., & Garfield, S. L. (1971). Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change. New York: Wiley.

Broekman, N. C., & Moller, A. T. (1973). Preferred seating position and distance in various situations. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 504-508.

Buckner, M., Meara, N. M., Reese, E. J., & Reese, M. (1987). Eye movement as an indicator of sensory component in thought. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34(3), 283-287.

Calia, V. F. (1966). The culturally deprived client: A reformulation of the counselor's role. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 13, 100-105.

Carkhuff, R. R., & Berenson, B. G. (1967). Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Carkhuff, R. R. (1971). The development of human resources. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Chaikin, A. L., Derlega, V. J., & Miller, S. J. (1976). Effects of room environment on self-disclosure in a counseling analogue. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 479-481.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20, 37-46.

Conway, F., & Siegelman, J. (1983, September). The awesome power of the mind-probers. Science Digest, 72-75, 91.

Dilts, R., Grinder, J., Bandler, R., & DeLozier, J. (1980). Neurolinguistic programming: The study of the structure of subjective experience. Cupertino, CA: Meta Publications.

Dilts, R. (1983). Applications of Neurolinguistic programming. Cupertino, CA: Meta Publications.

Egan, G. (1975). The skilled helper: A model for systematic helping and interpersonal relating. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Gladstein, G. A. (1974). Nonverbal communication and counseling/psychotherapy: A review. Counseling Psychologist, 4(3), 34-57.

Graves, J. R. & Robinson, J. D. (1976). Proxemic behavior as a function of inconsistent verbal and nonverbal messages. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 333-338.

Grinder, J., & Bandler, R. (1976). The structure of Magic II: A book about communication and change. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, Inc.

Hackney, H. (1974). Facial gestures and subject expression of feelings. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21, 172-178.

Harman, R.L., & O'Neill, C. (1981). Neurolinguistic programming for counselors. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 59, 449-453.

Hill, C. E., Siegelman, L., Gronsky, B. R., Sturniolo, R., & Fretz, B. R. (1981). Nonverbal communication and counseling outcome. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28(3), 203-212.

Hubble, M. A., Noble, F. C., & Robinson, S. E. (1981). The effect of counselor touch in an initial counseling session. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 533-535.

Inhelder, B., & Piaget, J. (1958). The growth of logical thinking from childhood to adolescence. New York: Basic Books.

Jacobson, S. (1983). Meta-cation: Prescription for some ailing educational processes. Cupertino, CA: Meta Publications.

Knapp, M. L. (1978). Nonverbal communication in human interaction (2nd ed.). New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.

Kraft, W. A. (1982). The effects of primary representational system congruence on relaxation in a Neurolinguistic Programming model.

(Doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43(7), 2372-B.

Laborde, G. Z. (1984). Influencing with integrity: Management skills for communication and negotiation. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.

LaCrosse, M. B. (1975). Nonverbal behavior and perceived counselor attractiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 563-566.LaFrance, M., & Ickes, W. (1981). Posture mirroring and interactional involvement: Sex and sex typing effects. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 5(3), 139-154.

LaFrance, M., & Ickes, W. (1981). Posture mirroring and interactional involvement: Sex and sex typing effects. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 5 (3), 139-154.

Lankton, S. R. (1980). Practical magic: A translation of basic Neurolinguistic Programming into clinical psychotherapy. Cupertino, CA: Meta Publications.

Leathers, D. G. (1978). Nonverbal communication systems. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Maurer, R. E., & Tindall, J. H. (1983). Effect of postural congruence on client's perception of counselor empathy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30(2), 158-163.

McCroskey, J., & Wheeless, L. (1976). Introduction to human communication. New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). Silent messages. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Rawls, D. T. (1989). The effects of matching nonverbal behavior and the primary representational system on the level of rapport in dyadic interactions. Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 2390-A. (University Microfilms No., 89-24, 735).

Reade, M. N., & Smouse, A. D. (1980). Effect of inconsistent verbal-nonverbal communication and counselor response mode on client estimate of counselor regard and effectiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27(6), 547-553.

Rogers, C. R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21, 95-103.

Sandhu, D. S. (1984). The effects of mirroring vs non-mirroring of clients' nonverbal behaviors on empathy, trustworthiness, and positive interaction in cross-cultural counseling dyads. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 1042-A. (University Microfilms No. 84-15, 746).

Scheflen, A. E. (1964). The significance of posture in communication systems. Psychiatry, 27, 316-331.

Smith, D. R., & Williamson. L. K. (1981). Interpersonal communication: Roles, rules, and strategies. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Smith-Hanen, S. S. (1977). Effects of nonverbal behaviors on judged levels of counselor warmth and empathy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 87-91.

Storms, R. J. (1982). A study of verbal and nonverbal procedures as methodologies for the establishment of counselor-client rapport. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 2360-2361B. (University Microfilm No. 82-18, 047).

Tepper, D. T., & Haase, R. F. (1978). Verbal and nonverbal communication of facilitative conditions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25, (1), 35-44.

Trout, D. L., & Rosenfeld, M. M. (1980). The effects of postural lean and body congruence on the judgment of psycholtherapeutic rapport. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 4(3), 176-189.

Tyler, L. (1964). The methods and processes of appraisal and counseling. In A. S. Thompson & D. E. Super (Eds.), The professional preparation of counseling psychologists. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Vontress, C. E. (1973). Counseling: Racial and ethnic factors. Focus on Guidance, 5, 1-10.

Wilson, W., & Calhoun, J. F. (1974). Behavior therapy and the minority client. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 11, 317-32

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Scores on the BLRI, CRF, and LNFRI in Mirrored and Non-Mirrored Conditions

	(Empathy)		(Trust)
Condition	BLRI	CRF	LNFRI
Mirrored			
M	10.60	64.77	49.40
SD	8.00	10.09	6.98
Non-Mirrored			
M	6.03	62.27	50.72
SD	7.96	8.74	5.68

*NOTE: n = 30 for each condition

Table 2

Two by Two Factorial Analyses of Variance Summary Revised Empathy Scale of BLRI

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Techniques	312.81	1	312.81	4.59*
Counselors	16.01	1	16.01	.235 (NS)
Counselors X Techniques	1.24	1	1.24	.018 (NS)
Error	3808.92	56	68.02	

* $p < .05$

Daya S. Sandhu is an assistant professor at University of Louisville, T. Glen Reeves, is professor at Mississippi State University, and Pedro Portes is an associate professor at University of Louisville. Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to Daya S. Sandhu, Department of Educational & Counseling Pychology, 320 Education Building, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292.